

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-25 and 27-28 are pending.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,751,623 (“Basso”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,593,936 (“Huang”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9 are patentable over Basso in view of Huang for at least the following reasons.

According to the claims, a description of audio-visual content resides on one client (e.g., a client) – instead of transferring an entirely new description from a second computer (e.g., a server) to the client in order to perform an update at a particular node of the description, the server sends to the client: i) a command that indicates the type of update (e.g., an add, delete or change command), ii) the location of the particular node, and iii) any data related to the update – the client can then execute the command and perform the update.

Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are not shown or suggested by Basso and Huang, alone or in combination.

According to the Office Action, Basso is relied upon to teach “said server sending to said client a command indicating a type of update to make at a particular node of a data structure residing at said client and describing an item

of content, wherein said particular node contains information describing an attribute of said item of audio-visual content and wherein said particular node is one of a plurality of nodes of said structure, wherein said plurality of nodes are associated with one another to form said structure; said server sending to said client the location of said particular node in said description; and said server retrieving and sending to said client any data related to said update” as recited in independent Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Basso does not teach that which it is relied upon as teaching.

According to Basso (column 5, lines 14-35; for clarity, material is presented in a different order than in the reference), “a session processes or presents a ... scene;” “components of a scene are coded as independent objects;” and “objects are transmitted ... along with scene description information.” According to Basso, “a set of ... files can be used to provide a complete session, with one of the set of ... files acting as a master file;” “objects that are related to a session ... will reside in one or more ... [of the] files;” “objects ... can be referenced by the master file, or any other file of a session, using universal resource locator (URL) calls. These ... objects can be stored in a remotely locally-available file ... located at the same client or host computer as the session files. Alternatively, these objects ... can be stored in a remotely stored file ... accessed over a distributed network.”

According to Basso, “the scene description information is organized using a tree structure” and “scene descriptions can be dynamically updated” (column 5,

lines 38-39, and column 4, line 63, respectively). According to Basso, a “file should allow easy editing” (column 3, lines 15-16).

Applicants respectfully submit that such generalizations do not show or suggest the specific limitations of Claim 1. While, according to Basso, it may be possible to update scene descriptions organized in a tree structure, Basso fails to teach how that that would be done. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the material cited above, nor Basso taken in its entirety, shows or suggests the specific limitations of Claim 1, which precisely recites “said server sending to said client a command indicating a type of update to make at a particular node of a data structure residing at said client and describing an item of content, wherein said particular node contains information describing an attribute of said item of audio-visual content and wherein said particular node is one of a plurality of nodes of said structure, wherein said plurality of nodes are associated with one another to form said structure; said server sending to said client the location of said particular node in said description; and said server retrieving and sending to said client any data related to said update.”

Basso apparently teaches objects can be remotely located. Basso apparently teaches that the objects can be transmitted with scene description information, although Basso does not appear to specifically teach that the scene description information can be remotely located. Regardless, Basso apparently teaches that the scene description information can be updated. Presumably, objects can also be updated, although Basso does not appear to teach that feature. Nevertheless, Basso fails to teach, or even suggest, how scene descriptions are updated. Applicants respectfully submit that Basso provides no

details with regard to the manner in which objects and/or scene descriptions are updated.

According to the Office Action, Basso “teaches that new instructions or rules can be transmitted to control the structural organization to allow easy and programmable or modification (sic) of structural organization to support multiple protocols. The new instructions or rules transmitted from the server to the client for changing structure reorganization of the various nodes of the tree and dynamically updates information of particular nodes of the tree (sic) (col. 5, lines 10-51, col. 25, line 53 – col. 26, line 32 and line 48 – col. 27, line 49)” (emphasis added). This is simply not correct, at least as understood. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the portions of Basso specifically cited in the Office Action, nor Basso in its entirety, shows or suggests what the Office Action says they teach, specifically “new instructions or rules transmitted from the server to the client for changing structure reorganization of the various nodes of the tree and dynamically updates information of particular nodes of the tree,” for the reasons already presented and for the additional reasons below.

The portions of Basso cited in the Office Action and repeated in the preceding paragraph apparently teach that Basso’s “Integrated Intermedia Format (IIF) organizes ... media data into segments;” that the “segment data could include access units that belong to a single object or multiple objects ...;” and that “[s]ince all access units are indexed relative to the beginning of a segment, the contents of a segment can be edited with in a segment with changes made to only a single entry in the access table that points to the segments (column 25; lines 1-2, 38-42 and 54-56; emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that neither these portions of Basso, nor Basso in its entirety, shows or suggests, generally, a server sending to the client: i) a command that indicates the type of update, ii) the location of the particular node, and iii) any data related to the update – the client can then execute the command and perform the update. The portions of Basso cited above appear to describe only a change to an access table. Regardless, Applicants respectfully submit that neither those portions of Basso, nor Basso in its entirety, shows or suggests “said server sending to said client a command indicating a type of update to make at a particular node of a data structure residing at said client and describing an item of content, wherein said particular node contains information describing an attribute of said item of audio-visual content and wherein said particular node is one of a plurality of nodes of said structure, wherein said plurality of nodes are associated with one another to form said structure; said server sending to said client the location of said particular node in said description; and said server retrieving and sending to said client any data related to said update” as recited in Claim 1.

The remainder of the cited portions of Basso appear to pertain primarily to the streaming of data and not to the updating of descriptions, although Basso does state “protocol-specific meta-data can be included to support multiple protocols and payload formats. Dynamic data reorganization is obtained by modifying only the meta-data. Extensibility ... is obtained by adding new construction rules and possibly new property specifications in the meta-object” (column 27, lines 25-32). However, Applicants respectfully submit that such generalizations do not show or suggest the specific limitations of Claim 1.

Basso follows the discussion summarized above with a discussion of meta-objects that apparently describe how objects and segments are generated, and that contain information of the properties associated with the objects. However, that discussion does not show or suggest how those properties are located and updated. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that the meta-object discussion does not show or suggest the specific limitations of Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that, at best, Basso teaches “a framework which allows an easy and programmable organization of media-data” (column 27, lines 10-14). While it may be possible to update such a framework, Basso fails to teach how updates are performed.

Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present claimed invention recite methods and systems that include additional features that may be integrated into or added on top of frameworks such as, but not limited to, Basso’s framework. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present claimed invention provide the capability to update a particular node within such a framework from a remote location by simply providing a command that indicates the type of update, the location of the particular node, and any data related to the update. Applicants submit that Basso does not teach this capability.

Applicants respectfully submit that Huang does not overcome the shortcomings of Basso, as noted on pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Basso and Huang, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest details of how scene descriptions are updated and/or who performs such updates. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Basso and Huang, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest “said server sending to said client a command indicating a type of update to make at a particular node of a data structure residing at said client ...; said server sending to said client the location of said particular node in said description; and said server retrieving and sending to said client any data related to said update, wherein said client executes said command and performs said update” as recited in Claim 1.

Each of the Claims 2-3, 6-7 and 9 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 plus additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Basso and Huang, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 2-3, 6-7 and 9 in combination with the limitations of Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-3, 6-7 and 9 are in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable claim.

In summary, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 11-25 and 27-28

According to the Office Action, Claims 11-25 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Basso. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the

embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 11-25 and 27-28 are patentable over Huang in view of Basso.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Huang and Basso, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. By similar rationale, Applicants respectfully assert that Huang and Basso, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claims 11 and 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and that Claims 11 and 23 are in condition for allowance.

Each of the Claims 12-22 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 11 plus additional limitations. Each of the Claims 24-25 and 27-28 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 23 plus additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Huang and Basso, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 12-22, 24-25 and 27-28 in combination with the limitations of their respective base claims. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submits that Claims 12-22, 24-25 and 27-28 are in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable claim.

In summary, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 11-25 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 4-5 and 8

According to the Office Action, Claims 4-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basso in view of Huang, and further in view of ISO/IEC MPEG 00/N3575 ("ISO/IEC"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 4-5 and 8 are patentable over Basso in view of Huang and further in view of ISO/IEC for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4-5 and 8 depend from independent Claim 1. As presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Basso and Huang, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. Applicants further assert that ISO/IEC does not overcome the shortcomings of Basso and Huang. The shortcomings of ISO/IEC with regard to the present claimed invention are presented in the Background Art section of the instant application.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Basso, Huang and ISO/IEC, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 1 and that Claim 1 is patentable over Basso, Huang and ISO/IEC. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 4-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and that Claims 4-5 and 8 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusions

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-9, 11-25 and 27-28 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO HAO & BARNES L.L.P.

Dated: September 24, 2008

/William A. Zarbis/

William A. Zarbis
Registration No. 46,120

Address: Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Phone: (408) 938-9060